

R E M A R K S

By this Amendment claim 1 has been amended to address and overcome the examiner's formality rejection under 35 USC 112 and to include the catalyst list of claim 8 (now canceled), and claim 16 has been corrected. Entry is in order.

In the outstanding Office Action the examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) or 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oroskar et al. The examiner refers to the paragraph in Oroskar et al. which bridges columns 3 and 4 (Example 1) wherein ethanol and hydrogen peroxide were mixed in the presence of a manganese dioxide catalyst to produce a gas product containing about 30 volume percent hydrogen, and states that the ethanol and hydrogen peroxide inherently reacted.

However, Example 1 did not utilize methanol, nor did it utilize as a catalyst one of the catalysts now recited in applicant's amended claim 1. The applicant has tested use of manganese oxide as a catalyst and it was not satisfactory.

The applicant requests allowance of the presented claims.

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

By:


Richard H. Tushin

Registration No. 27,297

Franklin Square, Third Floor West
1300 I Street N.W.

Washington, DC 20005-3353

(202) 906-8680